



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/059,815

01/28/2002

Paul Christopher Eastham

5693P003

6764

48102

7590

08/21/2006

NETWORK APPLIANCE/BLAKELY

12400 WILSHIRE BLVD

SEVENTH FLOOR

LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/059,815

Applicant(s)

EASTHAM, PAUL CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Original application contained claims 1 – 29. Presently, pending claims are 12 – 20.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the subject matter of the instant claims have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
2. As per claim 1 and 13, Applicant asserts Sitaraman does not teach “automatically configuring a network cache so that the network cache is able to communicate with a database to authenticate a user; and operating the network cache”. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the following rationale:
 - Sitaraman teaches, in the first place, the local cache is constructed by automatically obtaining a user record from the mother cache (or central database) in response to a user log-on attempt (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58). Therefore, the local cache is considered as being automatically configured and constructed over a network upon user's log-on. Sitaraman further discloses the advantage of this invention is that the local cache can thus be easily synchronized with a central database (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 30 – 35). Examiner asserts synchronization between the local cache and a central database indeed includes communicating and updating the local cache upon the detection of data difference between them.

Art Unit: 2131

- Therefore, Sitaraman does teach "automatically configuring a network cache so that the network cache is able to communicate with a database to authenticate a user".
- Accordingly, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims is patentably distinguished over the prior art and as such Applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 12 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,263,369).

As per claim 12, Sitaraman teaches a machine-readable medium having sequences of instructions stored therein which, when executed by a processor cause the processor to perform a process comprising:

automatically configuring a network cache (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58: in the first place, the local cache is constructed by automatically obtaining a user record from the mother cache (or central database) in response to a user log-on attempt) **so that the network cache is able to communicate with a database to authenticate a user; and operating the network cache** (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 21 – 35, Column 7 Line 49 – 55 and Column 9 Line 22 – 29: the local cache can be easily synchronized with a central database (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 30 – 35) – Examiner asserts synchronization between the local cache and a central database indeed includes communicating and updating the local cache upon the detection of data difference between them).

As per claim 13, Sitaraman teaches a device, comprising:
a network cache (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 21 – 35 and Figure 1); and
a user interface to allow an operator to enter a character string known by the operator to be within a user object located in a database such that the character string is used to automatically configure the network cache so that the network cache is able to communicate with a database to authenticate a user (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58, Column 2 Line 21 – 35, Column 7 Line 49 – 55 and Column 9 Line 22 – 29: automatically configured at a log-on network access event).

As per claim 14, Sitaraman teaches searching for a character string in a plurality of objects located in a database; selecting an object from a subset of objects found to

Art Unit: 2131

contain the character string; retrieving the object; receiving a selection of the attribute name associated with the character string in the object; and storing the attribute name in a configuration file in the network cache (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58, Column 2 Line 21 – 35, Column 7 Line 49 – 55 and Column 9 Line 22 – 29).

As per claim 15, Sitaraman teaches the character string is a user ID (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58: UserID and password are required at a log-on attempt).

As per claim 16, Sitaraman teaches receiving as input a password corresponding to the user ID (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 54 – 58: UserID and password are required at a log-on attempt).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 17 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,263,369), in view of Ouellette et al. (U.S. Patent 6321259).

As per claim 17, Sitaraman does not disclose expressly the attribute name corresponding to each group ID in the object is selected and stored in the network cache.

Ouellette teaches the attribute name corresponding to each group ID in the object is selected and stored in the network cache (Ouellette: Column 7 Line 4 – 29 & Dugan: Column 60 Line 9 – 11 and Column 41 Line 44 – 48: Ouellette teaches the attribute of group ID and Dugan teaches the corresponding attribute names (as the object reference ID) associated with hierarchical object structure (i.e., recursive loading of all classes) is stored in the cache).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ouellette within the system of Sitaraman because (a) Sitaraman teaches an intelligent network architecture that enables the network synchronization / communication between the local cache and central database system to provide the network services such as authentication, authorization and accounting purpose (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 21 – 35), and (b) Ouellette teaches, for an efficient authentication purpose, a hierarchical LDAP database server with an attribute inheritance schema organized in a hierarchical object structure (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 38 – 43 / Line 28 – 32 and Abstract Line 1 – 3).

As per claim 18, Sitaraman as modified teaches if a non-parental group object is found to contain the user ID; the network cache retrieves the non-parental group object (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 and Column 7 Line 23 – 29 & Figure 5: the options as

Art Unit: 2131

taught by Ouellette can have either one single group (i.e. parent group) or multiple groups associated with user ID (the optional groups are interpreted as non-parent groups associated with user ID);

receives a selection of the attribute names associated with attributes utilized to identify the non-parental group (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 & Dugan: Column 59 Line 53 – 60 and Column 43 Line 51 – 52: the logical name / object reference ID is equivalent to an attribute name (as distinct from the actual attribute value)), and stores the attribute names in a configuration file in the network cache (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 21 – 35).

As per claim 19, Sitaraman does not disclose expressly the network cache guesses which attribute names to select once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved.

Ouellette teaches the network cache guesses which attributes to select once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 and Column 7 Line 23 – 29 & Figure 5: the options as taught by Ouellette can have either one single group (i.e. parent group) or multiple groups associated with user ID (the optional groups are interpreted as non-parent groups associated with user ID and thereby the network cache needs to guess which optional group other than the direct parent group once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ouellette within the system of

Art Unit: 2131

Sitaraman because (a) Sitaraman teaches an intelligent network architecture that enables the network synchronization / communication between the local cache and central database system to provide the network services such as authentication, authorization and accounting purpose (Sitaraman: Column 2 Line 21 – 35), and (b) Ouellette teaches a hierarchical LDAP database server with an attribute inheritance schema organized in a hierarchical object structure for authentication purpose (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 38 – 43 / Line 28 – 32 and Abstract Line 1 – 3).

As per claim 20, Dugan as modified teaches the attribute names stored in the configuration file are checked for correctness (Ouellette: Column 8 Line 45 – 46: the attribute name must be validated and correct to further ensure the attribute value is also correct).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LBC



Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER



8/19/06